



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/650,329	08/29/2000	Thomas G. Adams	19927-000710US	8649

20350 7590 09/12/2003

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

NALEVANKO, CHRISTOPHER R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/650,329

Applicant(s)

ADAMS ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher R Nalevanko

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4,5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11, and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Maturi et al.

Regarding Claim 1, Maturi shows a method for a receiver to provide access to a system time clock (STC) to a decoder (col. 2 lines 1-30, col. 4 lines 40-48). Furthermore, Maturi shows receiving data from the decoder into a register in a bus interface (see fig. 3, col. 3 lines 10-42, col. 5 lines 44-50), latching a timestamp of the STC into another register in the bus after receiving the data (col. 3 lines 30-45, col. 5 lines 44-55, col. 6 lines 10-18, col. 7 lines 20-50), and providing a timestamp to the decoder by way of the register (col. 5 lines 44-50, col. 7 lines 28-36). Maturi shows (col. 5 lines 44-50, fig. 3) that each decoder has access to DRAM via a bus interface. This DRAM provides individual registers, or buffers, for video, audio, and frame information for timing. This is essential for the system to store and use the clock and associated time stamp to synchronize the system.

Regarding Claim 2, Maturi shows that the decoder is part of an audio-visual interface (col. 4 lines 40-52).

Regarding Claim 4, Maturi shows a method for synchronizing a digital video system comprising receiving a first transport packet from a transmitter (col. 2 lines 55-67), capturing a first system time clock timestamp at the start of receiving the first packet (col. 3 lines 20-25, 30-46, col. 7 lines 22-45, 64-67, col. 8 lines 1-15), obtaining a program clock reference timestamp (col. 5 lines 50-56), comparing the first STC timestamp to the PCR timestamp to generate comparison results (col. 7 lines 22-45, 65-67, col. 8 lines 1-30), and adjusting the STC frequency based on the comparison results in order to maintain synchronization (col. 8 lines 37-49).

Regarding Claim 5, Maturi shows that the method is accomplished in the receiver (col. 4 lines 40-48).

Regarding Claim 6, Maturi shows capturing a system timestamp with the decoder (col. 7 lines 22-36) and adjusting the system timestamp with a scaled offset based on a message delay time between the decoder and receiver to maintain synchronization (col. 7 lines 22-53, col. 8 lines 1-47).

Regarding Claim 7, Maturi shows receiving data from the decoder into a register in a bus interface (see fig. 3, col. 3 lines 10-42), latching a second timestamp of the STC into another register in the bus after receiving the data (col. 3 lines 30-45, col. 5 lines 50-55, col. 6 lines 10-18, col. 7 lines 20-50), and providing the second timestamp to the decoder by way of the register (col. 7 lines 28-36, col. 8 lines 1-48). Furthermore, it is clear that this decoder performs this operation a numerous amount of times, providing multiple timestamps, in order to process and synchronize the thousands of data packets required to play a stream of video.

Regarding Claim 8, Maturi shows that the decoder is part of an audio-visual interface (col. 4 lines 40-52).

Regarding Claim 10, Maturi shows a system for a receiver to provide access to a system time clock to a decoder comprising a communication bus coupled to the decoder, a bus interface in the receiver, a register for receiving data from the decoder, and a register for storing a timestamp of the STC after the first register receives the data (col. 3 lines 30-46, col. 5 lines 20-27, 50-57, col. 7 lines 22-45, 65-67, col. 8 lines 1-15, see figure 3).

Regarding Claim 11, Maturi shows that the decoder is part of an audio-visual interface (col. 4 lines 40-52).

Regarding Claim 13, the limitations of the system claim has been discussed with regards to the method claim of Claim 4.

Regarding Claim 14, Maturi shows that all of the necessary components (memory, latches, parsers, etc.) to decode and synchronize the data are present in the receiver (col. 4 lines 40-47, see figure 3).

Regarding Claim 15, Maturi shows capturing a system timestamp with the decoder (col. 7 lines 22-36) and adjusting the system timestamp with a scaled offset based on a message delay time between the decoder and receiver to maintain synchronization (col. 7 lines 22-53, col. 8 lines 1-47). Also, he shows using multiple values, or timestamps, to synchronize the data (col. 8 lines 1-47). Furthermore, it is clear that this system performs this operation a numerous amount of times, providing multiple

Art Unit: 2611

timestamps and adjustments, in order to process and synchronize the thousands of data packets required to play a stream of video.

Regarding Claim 16, the limitations of the system claim has been discussed with regards to the method claim of Claim 7.

Regarding Claim 17, Maturi shows that the decoder is part of an audio-visual interface (col. 4 lines 40-52).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 3, 9, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maturi et al.

Regarding Claims 3, 9, and 12, Maturi fails to show that the decoder is part of a computer network interface. Official Notice is taken that it is well known and expected in the art for a decoder to be included in a computer network. This allows the network to send MPEG data in order to display video. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the decoder in a computer network interface so that the computer network could decode and display MPEG data.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2611

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Naimpally et al U.S. Patent No. 5,650,825 discloses a method and apparatus for sending private data instead of stuffing bits in an MPEG bit stream.

Dokic U.S. Patent No. 5,699,392 discloses a method and system for the recovery of an encoder clock from an MPEG-2 transport stream.

Dokic U.S. Patent No. 5,959,659 discloses an MPEG-2 transport stream decoder having decoupled hardware architecture.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R Nalevanko whose telephone number is 703-305-8093. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on 703-305-4380. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Christopher Nalevanko
AU 2611
703-305-8093

cn
September 8, 2003


CHRIS GRANT
PRIMARY EXAMINER